

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P O Box 1450 Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.weylo.gov

ELECTRONIC

02/27/2009

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/553,721	09/06/2006	Lionel Wolovitz	307742US91PCT	2053	
OBLON SPIX	7590 02/27/200 /AK MCCI ELLAND	9 MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.	EXAM	IINER	
1940 DUKE S	1940 DUKE STREET			RUBIN, BLAKE J	
ALEXANDRI	A, VA 22314		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2457		
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com oblonpat@oblon.com jgardner@oblon.com

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Advisory Action	10/553,721	WOLOVITZ ET AL.				
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit				
	BLAKE RUBIN	2457				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence addr	ess			
THE REPLY FILED 10 February 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS	APPLICATION IN CONDITION FO	R ALLOWANCE.				
1. \(\times\) The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Application for Continued Examination (RGE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit eal (with appeal fee) in compliance v CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed v	, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request			
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing						
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, w no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejec						
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE					
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.138(a). The date have been filled is the date for purposes of determining the period to nave been filled is the date for purposes of the expiration date of the sactification of the special purpose of the special purpose set forth in (b) above, if checked, Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any seared patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL.	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.13 tension and the corresponding amount of thortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing date	of the fee. The appropriationally set in the final Office	te extension fee e action; or (2) as			
	liance with 27 CER 41 27 must be f	ilad within two months	of the data of			
I. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since						
Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed w						
AMENDMENTS						
 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, t 			cause			
(a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);						
 (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below); (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for 						
(c) I hey are not deemed to place the application in per appeal; and/or	ter form for appeal by materially rec	lucing or simplifying th	e issues for			
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.						
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).						
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	21. See attached Notice of Non-Cor	npliant Amendment (F	TOL-324).			
Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):						
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment						
non-allowable claim(s). 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a)	☐ will not be entered or b) ☑ will	he entered and an ev	rolanation of			
how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:		be entered and an ex	planation of			
Claim(s) objected to:						
Claim(s) rejected: 1-37.						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE						
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 						
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	vercome all rejections under appea	I and/or appellant fails	to provide a			
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation						
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER						
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered bu	t does NOT place the application in	condition for allowand	e because:			

Other: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u>.
 /ARIO ETIENNE/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2457

12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).

Continuation of 13. Other:

Claim Objections

With respect to claim 24, the claim recites the limitation "the wireless terminal" (lines 2 and 4), there is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. The examiner suggests amending line 2 to recite "a wireless terminal" to resolve the indefiniteness. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections

Claims 1-16, 19, 26, and 32-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Logston et al (PCT International Publication No. WO 01/77815 A2, hereinafter Logston) in view of Piskiel et al (PCT International Publication No. WO 97/46939, hereinafter Piskiel).

With respect to claim 1, applicant argues that Piskiel fails to resolve the deficiency of resolving communications independent of a session based protocol.

The examiner respectfully disagrees. While Piskiel certainly mentions communicating using a session based protocol (ie the TCP cited by the applicant on page 15), it is not exclusivity of the protocol by which Piskiel intends to communicate. Precisely the opposite. Piskiel cites several link level communication possibilities (TCP, Novel NetWare LAN, and WAN) by which communication can be carried out regardless of the various clients using various protocols to communicate with each other (page 14, lines 22-30; page 15, lines 1-11), thus resulting in a session independent protocol.